

Review Updates (The Non-Controversial Issues)

New Development:

- Recommended Decision: Approve
- Concern Raised in Proposed Decision:
- Reason for Recommended Action: State has finalized TMDL Implementation Guidance as requested and satisfied all three elements needed for voluntary approach.
- Revisions to Proposed Rationale: Updated to reflect guidance has been final and minor editorial changes to improve clarity.
- Concerns raised during public comment period:
- Status: Rationale drafted; summary comments drafted; response to comments in progress.

Forestry Landslides:

- Recommended Decision: Approve
- Concern Raised in Proposed Decision: State does not have programs in place to protect high-risk landslide areas to ensure water quality standards and designated uses are achieved.
- Reason for Recommended Action:
- Revisions to Proposed Rationale: Citing additional science to show that harvesting and road construction on high-risk landslide areas does increase risk of landslides and impact water quality.
- Concerns raised during public comment period:
- Status: Rationale drafted but still working to improve science discussion; summary comments drafted; response to comments not started.

Response to General Comments:

- Status: Response to comments drafted; responses to 14 comments drafted (3 more to go although a few responses may need to be tweaked based on final decisions for other management measures)

Responding to Public Comments Other Aspects of Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program that We Did Solicit Comments (such as on the Effectiveness of Oregon's General Monitoring and Tracking Efforts)

- Recommended Action: Acknowledge comments received. State that we did not solicit comments on these aspects of Oregon's program and are only considering comments related to new development, OSDS, additional management measures for forestry, agriculture, and general comments regarding CZARA at this time. There will be another opportunity for the public to comment on these specific aspects of Oregon's program when NOAA and EPA propose to approve Oregon's program.
- Reason for This Response:
 - Avoids responding substantively to comments that may indicate a decision the federal agencies have made a decision about elements of Oregon's program until we are assured we have received all comments and information on these MMs.
 - Avoids providing a substantive response that may conflict the decision and statements made in the rationale we will draft once we propose approval of these MMs.
- Next Steps:
 - Develop standard response that undergoes technical, policy, managerial and legal review.

Review Updates (The Non-Controversial Issues)

New Development:

- Recommended Decision: Approve
- Concern Raised in Proposed Decision:
- Reason for Recommended Action: State has finalized TMDL Implementation Guidance as requested and satisfied all three elements needed for voluntary approach.
- Revisions to Proposed Rationale: Updated to reflect guidance has been final and minor editorial changes to improve clarity.
- Concerns raised during public comment period:
- Status: Rationale drafted; summary comments drafted; response to comments in progress.

Forestry Landslides:

- Recommended Decision: Approve
- Concern Raised in Proposed Decision: State does not have programs in place to protect high-risk landslide areas to ensure water quality standards and designated uses are achieved.
- Reason for Recommended Action:
- Revisions to Proposed Rationale: Citing additional science to show that harvesting and road construction on high-risk landslide areas does increase risk of landslides and impact water quality.
- Concerns raised during public comment period:
- Status: Rationale drafted but still working to improve science discussion; summary comments drafted; response to comments not started.

Comment [CJ1]: Am confused as to how this statement support an approval action.

Response to General Comments:

- Status: Response to comments drafted; responses to 14 comments drafted (3 more to go although a few responses may need to be tweaked based on final decisions for other management measures)

Comment [CJ2]: Should we include "Types or examples of general comments" as a section?

Responding to Public Comments Other Aspects of Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program that We Did Solicit Comments (such as on the Effectiveness of Oregon's General Monitoring and Tracking Efforts)

- Recommended Action: Acknowledge comments received. State that we did not solicit comments on these aspects of Oregon's program and are only considering comments related to new development, OSDs, additional management measures for forestry, agriculture, and general comments regarding CZARA at this time. There will be another opportunity for the public to comment on these specific aspects of Oregon's program when NOAA and EPA propose to approve Oregon's program.
- Reason for This Response:
 - Avoids responding substantively to comments that may indicate a decision the federal agencies have made a decision about elements of Oregon's program until we are assured we have received all comments and information on these MMs.
 - Avoids a providing a substantive response that may conflict the decision and statements made in the rationale we will draft once we propose approval of these MMs.
- Next Steps:
 - Develop standard response that undergoes technical, policy, managerial and legal review.